

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/806,340	MATSUZAKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Callie E. Shosho	1714	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Allowed

(1) Callie E. Shosho.

(3) _____.

(2) Shruti Costales.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 February 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in ~~the Notice of Allowability~~ Part II above.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner's amendment was agreed to and authorized by Ms. Costales. The amendment was made in order to ensure that each of the present claims recites the proper status identifier.

Additionally, with respect to the declaration filed 12/11/03, the examiner noted that there was a typing error on page 3 of the declaration with respect to the formula for R_1 , R_6 , or R_7 . Specifically, the Table on page 3 of the declaration recites the formula " $\text{CON}[\text{CH}_2\text{CH}(\text{C}_2\text{H}_5)\text{C}_4\text{H}_9(n)]$ ". However, given that this formula corresponds to $\text{CONR}_{16}\text{R}_{17}$ (see, for instance, page 9, line 19-20 or Table 2 (118) of the present specification or present claim 6), it is clear that the correct formula is " $\text{CON}[\text{CH}_2\text{CH}(\text{C}_2\text{H}_5)\text{C}_4\text{H}_9(n)]_2$ ". Ms. Costales agreed that an inadvertent typing error had been made and faxed to the examiner a corrected Table, wherein the above typing error has been corrected, to replace the Table found on page 3 of the declaration filed 12/11/03.